UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,489	01/03/2006	Thomas Lederer	2003P07074WOUS	8264

22116   7590   02/17/2011
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/17/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Detailed Action

Claims 12-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 have been cancelled. This is

a response to the After Final Amendments filed on 2/10/11. Claims 23, 29 have been

amended to correct informalities. The After Final amendment is entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/10/11 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicant argues in substance,

a) the examiner has not proved obviousness under 35 USC 103,

b) the prior art does not teach, the creation of a link and save command,

c) XP and Outlook utilized the claimed method,

d) the examiner has used hindsight reasoning,

In reply to a) and b);The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*,

383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for

determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
     obviousness or nonobviousness.

And further, The Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550

U.S. ___, ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) identified a number of rationales to

support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper "functional

approach" to the determination of obviousness as laid down in Graham. The key to

supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s)

why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted

that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.

As per claim 12, 18, 31 Outlook 2002 teaches a device for user-based

processing of at least one electronic message(Outlook 2002 installed on computer), the

device comprising: an e-mail client configured to receive at least one electronic

message having a file attachment(Fig.2).

Windows XP teaches a user file system configured to store the file

attachment(Fig.3); an attachment insertion unit configured to insert the replaced file

attachment in a selected memory location in a file system(Fig.4); a message link

insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the selected memory location, the

message link referring to the electronic message(Fig.7,11; user can create a shortcut

the message and/or save electronic message); and a control unit configured to control

the e-mail client, the attachment substitution unit, the message link insertion unit and

the attachment insertion unit(Windows XP installed on a computer with a processor,

memory, etc.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Outlook 2002 to include creating shortcuts to an

email message and saving the shortcut as taught by Microsoft XP in order to save

emails and/or create shortcuts to email for quick access.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Outlook 2002 and Microsoft XP in order to save emails and/or create shortcuts to email for quick access.

Window Outlook 2002 and XP does not explicitly teach an attachment substitution unit configured to replace a file attachment of a received electronic message with a memory location link and link after user input is received that requires the file attachment to be saved and linked.

Coppinger explicitly teach an attachment substitution unit configured to replace a file attachment of a received electronic message with a memory location link and link after user input is received that requires the file attachment to be saved and linked. (Fig.1, 2; inherently the file attachment is saved before linking).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Microsoft Outlook 2002 and XP to include an attachment substitution unit configured to replace a file attachment of a received electronic message with a memory location link as taught by Coppinger in order to link an attachment and a memory location link to an email(Coppinger, para.0010).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Outlook 2002, Windows XP, and Coppinger in order to link an attachment and a memory location link to an email(Coppinger, para.0010).

Outlook 2002 in view of Windows XP in view of Coppinger does not explicitly teach the use of a save as and link command.

However taken into consideration, The Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) identified a number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper "functional approach" to the determination of obviousness as laid down in Graham. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. EXEMPLARY RATIONALES Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of obviousness include: (A)   Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Outlook 2002 in view of Windows XP in view of Coppinger teaches the link and save as command as two separate commands(Windows XP, Figs.1-12, Coppinger, Figs.1,2).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Outlook 2002 in view of Windows XP in view of Coppinger of having two separate commands for linking and saving to combine both of these command into one command, by combining the prior art elements would yield a predictable result which is when a user uses the save and link command, a file would be saved and linked at the same time, which save a user's time.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Outlook 2002, Windows XP, and Coppinger in order to save's a user's time by executing only one command to save and link a file.

Therefore based upon *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966) and KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007), the examiner has proved obviousness under 35 USC 103.

In reply to c); Pertaining to whether the someone actually used the method of XP and Outlook, the applicant in essence is arguing non-statutory subject matter, e.g. a person doing the steps of XP and Outlook as claimed. XP and Outlook teaches the functionality of the claimed language, and it is not necessary for the examiner to provide evidence of whether a person uses the claimed method of XP and Outlook as this is non-statutory subject matter, therefore showing that XP and Outlook teaches the claimed method is sufficient .

In reply to d); In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451